

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 23, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 23, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-20 are rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 1 and 8 are amended to clarify the invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,718,126 and claims 16-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,216 in view of *Horsky* (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,338). Applicant submits, along with this response, a terminal disclaimer to obviate the rejections. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-7 and 16-20.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 8, 9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Kim* (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,800). Applicant has amended claim 8 and submits that the reference *Kim* does not disclose an apparatus for vaporizing a solid precursor, comprising a first wall to support an inlet, at least one surface contained in the housing for application of the solid precursor, wherein the at least one surface is located on a second wall adjoining and substantially perpendicular to the first wall. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 8, and claims dependent thereon, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Onoe, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,270,839) in view of *Suntola, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,413,022). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on grounds that the references do not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for the invention as claimed. The reference *Onoe, et al.* teaches an apparatus for feeding raw material for chemical vapor deposition from a container [1] within an oven [7]. The reference *Suntola, et al.* teaches a method for growing thin films from a glass tube [10] with heating elements [47, 56, 68] coupled to an outer surface of the glass tubes. The references *Onoe, et al.* and *Suntola, et al.* do not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for at least two surfaces, wherein an inlet is substantially perpendicular to the at least two surfaces, and at least one heating member contained in the housing, as recited in claim 1. Further, *Onoe, et al.* teaches away from the combination as the oven [7] serving as the heating device can be smaller to facilitate service and reduce parts (Col. 6, Lines 19-21). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is patentable and, as such, claims 12-15, which depend thereon, are patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1, and claims dependent thereon, and claims 12-15, is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Onoe, et al.* in view of *Horsky* (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,338). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on grounds that the references do not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for the invention as claimed. The reference *Onoe, et al.* is discussed above. *Horsky* does not provide a motivation to combine as the heater plate [20] is not shown contained in the wall of the body [29]. The heater plate [20] is shown only inside an interior volume, which may be surrounded by a water jacket [17]. Further, *Horsky* provides no teaching or motivation to use a carrier gas as the flow of gas from the vaporizer to the ionization chamber is determined by vaporizer temperature, the higher the temperature-the higher the flow rate (Col. 5, Lines 51-54).

Therefore, the references *Onoe, et al.* and *Horsky* do not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for a housing defining an interior volume having an inlet for receiving a carrier gas and an outlet for delivering the carrier gas, and at least one

heating member contained in the wall of the housing, as recited in claim 16. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 16, and claims dependent thereon, is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)

384564_1